



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/414,454	10/07/1999	MURALIDHARAN RAMASWAMY	PHA-23.780	3317

24737 7590 05/23/2003

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP
580 WHITE PLAINS RD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

SHAH, SANJIV

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

12

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/414,454

Applicant(s)

RAMASWAMY, MURALIDHARAN

Examiner

Sanjiv D. Shah

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-19, 21-26, 28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 25, 26, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-13, 15-19 and 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotiroff et al. (Patent # 5,852,810) in view of Kovacs (Patent # 6,542,813)

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Sotiroff et al. teaches the claimed invention of network connecting plurality of servers as shown in fig 1.

Connecting to one of plurality of servers is shown in fig 1.

Receiving a graphical map and displaying of a geographical map from the server is described in abstract, lines 4-6.

Entering search criteria for locating at least one hypertext document based on a geographic position is shown in fig 6a, element 100, 102, 104.

Receiving a search result indicating the hypertext document located in accordance with the search criteria is shown in fig 6a, element 108 and as described in col. 4, lines 32-52.

Since Sotiroff et al. teaches a client/server architecture with access on Internet, it is obvious that information can be accessed from any server.

Sotiroff et al. teaches retrieving a hypertext document, however, it fails to teach including geographic position information in a metatag. Kovacs does.

Art Unit: 2172

Specifically, Kovacs teaches a geographic position information in a metatag as described in col. 7, lines 30-37.

Therefore it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a metatag as taught by Kovacs in the method of Sotiroff et al. because it provides authors to add descriptive information to a web page.

With respect to claim 2, such as claimed step of selecting the hypertext document included in the search result and downloading information relating to the selected hypertext document, Sotiroff et al teaches information describing the specific point of interest held in a database and can be accessed by the user selecting the corresponding point on the display, and user is allowed to build a list of points of interest and can be submitted for response, see col. 2, lines 25- 33.

With respect to claim 3, Sotiroff et al clearly discloses the hypertext document is a World Wide Web page and the computer network is the Internet, see abstract and col. 2, lines 18-23.

With respect to claim 4, Sotiroff et al discloses that the search system and method is performed as an aspect of executing a program for browsing the World Wide Web, see col. 2, lines 18-21.

Art Unit: 2172

Regarding claim 5, Kovacs teaches the claimed invention of hypertext info with location information as described in col. 7, lines 30-37.

Regarding claims 6, 25 and 29, combination of Sotiroff et al. and Kovacs teaches the claimed invention as described above. Sotiroff does not teach naming hypertext document based upon geographic position information. Kovacs does. Specifically Kovacs teaches a Metatag that names the document based upon geographic position information as described in col. 7, lines 30-37.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 7-13, 15-19 and 21-24 are allowed.

Response to Arguments


4. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/14/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited prior art of Sotiroff et al. does not teach a web page search engine. Examiner disagrees. Specifically a web home page is searched which is a hypertext document and claimed limitation provides for one or more hypertext documents. Therefore the rejection is proper.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 25, 26, 28 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanjiv D. Shah whose telephone number is (703) 305-8355. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Sanjiv D. Shah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2172

Sanjiv Shah
May 19, 2003